



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,248	12/19/2001	Masanori Aritomi	35.C16075	7217

5514 7590 10/18/2006

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER	
PITARO, RYAN F	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/021,248

Applicant(s)

ARITOMI, MASANORI

Examiner

Ryan F. Pitaro

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-8,11-15 and 18-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-8,11-15 and 18-22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1,4-8,11-15 and 18-22, have been examined.

Response to Amendment

2. This communication is responsive to Amendment D, filed 7/25/2006.
3. Claims 1,4-8,11-15 and 18-22 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 15, 23, 24,25, are independent claims. In Amendment D, Claims 2-3,9-10,16-17, 23-26 were cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1,4-8,11-15 and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Onaga ("Onaga" US 6,266,693) in view of Heddaya et al ("Heddaya", US 6,622,157).

As per claim 1, Onaga discloses an information processing apparatus capable of communicating with a plurality of peripheral devices, said apparatus comprising: a storage device, for storing predetermined objects for the peripheral devices based on directory information (Column 1 lines 25-43); detection means, for detecting specific objects in the directory information read from said storage device, the specific objects including at least a first specific object corresponding to a first one of the plurality of peripheral devices and a second specific object corresponding to a second one of the plurality of peripheral devices (Figure 9, Column 1 lines 25- 43); display means, for displaying, in accordance with a tree list, the specific objects detected by said detection means (Figure 9); and control means, for permitting said display means to display, in accordance with the tree list, the specific objects detected by said detection means (Column 12 lines 51-64). Onaga fails to teach displaying devices in order of devices between apparatuses. However, Heddaya teaches a method such that the first specific object is displayed in preference to the second specific object if a number of other information processing apparatuses which exist between the first peripheral device and said information processing apparatus is smaller than a number of other information processing apparatuses which exist between the second peripheral device and said information processing apparatus (Column 3 lines 65 - Column 4 lines 4). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the

Art Unit: 2174

teaching of Heddaya with the method of Onaga. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a faster response time and less network traffic.

¶ As per claim 4, Onaga-Heddaya teaches an information processing apparatus, wherein said control means performs the sorting for an object display, so that the specific object is displayed at a higher location on a list (Onaga, Column 12 lines 51-64, Figure 9).

As per claim 5, Onaga-Heddaya teaches an information processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein, when the specific objects detected by said detection means are to be displayed on said display means in accordance with the tree list, and when one of the specific objects cannot be referred to directly due to access right limitations, said control means does not permit said display means to display that one specific object, and wherein, when each one of the specific objects is unable to be referred to directly due to access right limitations, said control means permit said display means to display a higher object for which there are no access right problems (Onaga, Column 10 lines 1-54).

As per claim 6, Onaga-Heddaya teaches a tree structure in which the specific objects include an object for a printer device (Onaga, Figure 9).

As per claim 7 Onaga-Heddaya teaches an information processing apparatus, wherein the specific objects include an object for a compound device including a printer function (Onaga, Column 2 lines 26-34).

Claims 8,15 are individually similar in scope to claim 1, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 11 and 18 are individually similar in scope to claim 4 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 12 and 19 are individually similar in scope to claim 5, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 13 and 20 are individually similar to scope to claim 6, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 14 and 21 are individually similar to scope to claim 7, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale

As per claim 22, Onaga-Heddaya teaches a computer readable storage medium (Column 4 lines 40 -65) for storing the control program.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,4-8,11-15 and 18-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Monday through Thursday, and on alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro
Art Unit 2174
Patent Examiner

RFP

Kristine Kincaid
SUPERVISOR
TECHNICAL STAFF 2:00